DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 551 UD 007 201

By- Kimbrough, Ralph B.

Community Power Systems and Strategies for Educational Change.

Pub Date 8 Jul 66

Note- 30p.; Paper presented at the Planned Curriculum for Youth 1966 Conf. (Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y., July 8, 1966).

EDRS Price MF- $0.25 HC- $1.60

Descriptors- Community Influence, *Comparative Analysis, *Educational Policy, *Political Power, *Power Structure, *School Community Relationship, School Districts

It is the responsibility of educators to initiate and exert leadership in developing an adaptive system to promote educational change. It is essential that educators be concerned with the total development of an adaptive system in the community, cooperating with other group leaders outside of education, and not feasible educational changes within an existing system. In the past educators have primarily used persuasive techniques to promote educational change, which though often not effective can become useful parts of planned strategies. After the goals of change are clearly defined, priorities can be assigned to political strategies. The superintendent of schools holds a powerful public position which he can use to influence change. The time taken by the superintendent to talk to influentials in the community could be a critical factor in the acceptance of school projects in the district. Impact, especially in open power systems, can be produced by a cohesive group of teachers combined with effective political leadership. (JL)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED025551

UD 007 201

07201

Letter Sent 1/20/67 WW

COMMUNITY POWER SYSTEMS AND STRATEGIES FOR EDUCATIONAL CHANGE*

Ralph B. Kimbrough
University of Florida

Numerous authorities have discussed the relative impermanency of educational innovations. In accounting for the slowness of change educators are prone to identify various elements in the internal organization of the school as agents of resistance to the adoption of new ideas and practices. For instance, bureaucratic school organizations and the conservatism of teachers and administrators are often seen as elements which retard the adoption of educational innovations. How free is the school to initiate planned changes in program without reference to its environment? How much power do school leaders have over the legitimation of innovations in the school district?

Viewing the school system as insulated or isolated from the political environment contributes to the impermanency of planned changes. Of even greater concern, however, is that this view sometimes leads to changes which are not in the best interests of education. An example of the latter is the perversion of some promising innovations into panaceas for saving tax revenue by conservative leaders in the community.

The foundation sponsored trial of educational television in one school district was followed by political demands from laymen in the

*No portion of this paper may be reproduced in any form without the written permission of the author.

This paper was presented at the Columbia University Teachers College Planned Curriculum For Youth - 1966 Conference, July 8, 1966.

ED025551

district for the adoption of numerous dollar saving schemes. Community leaders interpreted the use of television as an opportunity to save salaries and building costs rather than as a means to improve learning. The television "experiment" whetted the appetites of the conservative leaders for the adoption of other "innovations" to save money. Large group instruction, an extended school day, and a congested platoon curriculum organization were adopted by the board of education. School architects voiced concern about the squeeze of classroom space in the new facilities constructed in the district. This example illustrates that, even though they have the power to initiate certain changes, educators may not have the power to legitimize the change. Thus educational changes initiated by educators are often twisted in the process of adoption to serve noneducational goals.

Another idea not to be overlooked is that the process of planned change also involves the exercise of leadership to resist changes which might be detrimental to the school. For example, some extremist groups often press for book burnings and thought control methods which most reasonable persons would not classify as desirable changes. Also, we must realize that pressure for school changes from environmental changes is inevitable. The environmental changes affect school operation. In the future the educator will be faced with a whirlwind of socioeconomic change. Is the educator to ride out the whirlwind? Can educators influence the whirlwind? Will educators be engulfed by the whirlwind?

The term community power system refers to the dynamics, distribution, and structure of political power among the interacting persons and groups within the school district. Primary attention in this paper is directed

to the importance of the community power system in the planning of educational change. The state and national power systems are supra-systems of the community power system. In this paper the school system is viewed as an interacting subsystem of the community power system. Thus, I am suggesting that leadership for change in education takes place within the dynamics of interacting social systems in which the school is not as insulated from the political environment as some educators would like to think.

Studies of Community Power Structure

Within the past fifteen years many studies of community power structure have been made.[1] These studies have contributed much to our understanding of the decision-making process in local school districts.

Unfortunately the term power structure has been popularly misused to refer to selfish power wielders who are opposed to the common good of the community. I am not using this restrictive, muckraking definition of the term. Every community has a political system for making decisions. The only alternative would be anarchy. Through empirical study we can describe the general distribution of power in decision-making among the interacting leaders and groups in any given community. This relative distribution of power is what we mean by the term community power structure.

---

[1]Discussion of some of these studies is found in the following books: Robert Agger, et. al., The Rulers and the Ruled (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964); Edward C. Banfield, Political Influence (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961); Robert A. Dahl, Who Governs? (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961); Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953); Ralph B. Kimbrough, Political Power and Educational Decision-Making (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1964); Robert Presthus, Men at the Top (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964).

Research indicates clearly that different communities may have dissimilar community power structures. In some communities political power is distributed among a number of competing groups. Other communities may be ruled by a singular structure of interacting power wielders. There is evidence in support of a continuum of typologies for community power structures. At one end of the continuum is located the monopolistic type of power structure as described by Floyd Hunter in his Community Power Structure. The pluralistic power structure which was discussed by Robert A. Dahl in Who Governs? would be located at the other extreme of the continuum.

Although we can profitably describe typologies of community power structures, I am continually persuaded by research data that much variation exists within each typology. Thus, power for each community will have unique qualities.

Power Systems

Throughout the remainder of this paper I will emphasize the concept of social system in describing the phenomenon for decision-making in local school districts. The term power structure is more restrictive than power system in describing the dynamic exercise of social power.

From our studies of community power we can identify and describe some of the important elements in power systems. Every community power system, for instance, has a category of power wielders which we will refer to as influentials. These are persons who have so much power in the system that their influence upon the opinion and action of others is crucial in the legitimation of important community projects. In the system other leaders are identified who perform important roles in

maintaining the system and its subsystems. For instance, descriptions of community power structures refer to "organizational leaders," "leg-men," and "ranking politicians" who are important in making the system go. Formal and informal power groups or subsystems are important elements in conceptualizing the total system of community power. Power wielders in the system have beliefs about community living which influence the development of normative perceptions in the system. Included in these normative perceptions are idealized notions of what schools ought to be. The degree of effective citizen participation varies between communities and is an important element in describing the system.

Through the interaction of these conceptual elements the cultural and structural properties of the community power system are formed. This gives the system its particular state or quality. For example, through the interaction of leaders around a series of community projects, patterns of interactions and important channels of communication in decision-making crystallize. Incidentally, in many school districts educators have not participated effectively in the crystallization of patterns of interaction in the political system. Leadership hierarchies (or a hierarchy) emerge and differentiation in leadership roles occurs in the power system. Important norms are generated in the system concerning how decisions ought to be made and how a person should behave in using the system for promoting community improvement projects. As mentioned previously, the influentials in the system hold beliefs about community living which contribute to the development of normative perceptions (expectations) about the purpose and structure of community agencies, including the school. The normative perceptions of power wielders, combined with the

pursuit of personal financial gain, help explain leader behavior in the system concerning decisions in such projects as new civic auditoriums, improved highways, urban renewal projects, school building programs, hospitals, airports, planning and zoning, and the like.

We may, therefore, view the political power structure of the community as a system. The system has a boundary which is often referred to in "our town" type of expressions. The system acts in order to survive in its environment--the state and national power systems. Environmental agencies often experience difficulty in exchanging information with the system, especially in instances where the exchange of information might produce stress. For example, the personnel of school systems will report information which will help them to "look good" to regional accrediting agencies and to state authorities. Cities will act to resist federal inputs of energy, information, and matter which would drastically change segregated housing and schooling. The power system learns and adjusts its behavior through the process of feedback.

Social system theorists may classify systems as closed or open. I am well aware of the point made by many authorities that there is no such thing as a closed living system. However, I also agree with Chin and Hearn that the terms closed and open are useful in thinking about the general dynamics of social systems.[2] Actually there is no such thing as absolutely

---

[2]See Robert Chin, "The Utility of Systems Models and Developmental Models for Practicioners," in Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth Benne, and Robert Chin (eds.), The Planning of Change (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961) and Gordon Hearn, Theory Building in Social Work (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958).

closed or absolutely open living systems. An absolutely closed system would be dead. An absolutely open system would ~~be no system at all.~~ become so loaded with conflicting inputs that it would cease to survive. Therefore, when I speak of "open" and "closed" community power systems in this paper I am referring to the relative degree of closedness or openness.

In closed power systems entropy is maximized with the resultant tendency toward equilibrium. Closed systems react to environmental inputs of matter, energy, and information so as to restore the system to its original state—to maintain the status quo. For example, some racially segregated school districts maintain closure to environmental inputs of energy (i.e., leadership of federal officials), matter (i.e., new residents), and information (i.e., mass media) which favor integration of schools. The social system of an individual school or of its suprasystem, the school district organization, may exhibit closed characteristics with reference to educational innovations. The closed faculty system of an elementary school may hold doggedly to a traditional curriculum organization in the face of strong environmental demands to adopt another plan.

In open systems entropy is minimized. Open systems tend toward a steady state—the reaction to environmental inputs by a shift in activity or a modification in goals. Thus, an open system may willingly adopt limited school desegregation and integration in reacting to the environmental inputs referred to in the above paragraph. The faculty of an elementary school with an open social system may willingly adopt a nongraded school organization as a response to inputs from its environment.

I will now proceed with a description and discussion of different types of community power systems. This will be followed by a discussion of implications for curriculum change.

Examples of Closed Community Power Systems

Variation in the conceptual elements of community power systems produces different typologies of community power. These systems may exhibit different degrees of closedness or openness. Power systems with closed characteristics will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

Monopolistic Systems of Power

In a monopolistic system a group of interacting influentials exercises a dominant, not necessarily complete, influence over the establishment and maintenance of public policies in the community. The influentials in the structure may represent different crowds or socio-economic interests. These men seldom rule without some opposition. The opposition, however, is neither exercised by the same competing groups of power wielders for more than a period of two elections nor in decisions transcending several issues. For instance, the emergence of sporadic groups during a crisis development--such as the loss of school accreditation due to inadequate financing, unless persisting as solidary factions through time to press for other significant changes in the political system--does not herald the emergence of a competitive or pluralistic power structure.

Monopolistic power structures represent variations in closure to the emergence of leadership. Some are so solidary as to constitute, within a given period of time, closed societies. Environmental inputs which threaten the system often produce stress followed by an increase in group solidarity. Although I cannot substantiate this, I am of the opinion that the little "closed societies" are in the minority and atypical of

most monopolistic power structures. I believe that many monopolistic power structures can be opened to change through the exercise of effective educational leadership.

The occupation of leaders included within the boundary of the monopolistic system varies. In some communities the influentials are drawn largely from economic interests. The rulers of other communities may be drawn from the professions, labor unions, and public officials (politicians) representative of a political machine. In any event most important decisions regarding community policy are made within the boundary of the singular system of influentials.

In most instances, but not all, monopolistic power systems have a higher degree of closedness than openness. Closed social systems effectively limit the exchange of matter, energy, and information with their environment (i.e., state, regional, national systems). The system resists energy, matter, and information that would tend to disturb the goals, norms, interaction patterns, and normative perceptions about community living. For example, certain power systems (North and South) have demonstrated surprising ability to survive inputs of information (mass media, printed documents) and energy (court orders, federal agents) in maintaining racial segregation. In some instances only a massive input of energy (troops) of sufficient force to destroy the system has brought about a shift in activity.

Let us further illustrate the concept by an actual case from a recently completed USOE research project.[3] One school district of

---

[3]Ralph B. Kimbrough, Informal County Leadership Structure and Controls Affecting Educational Policy Decision-Making (Cooperative Research Project 1324. Gainesville, Florida: College of Education: University of Florida, 1964).

30,000 population studied was effectively dominated by a very small, informal, elite group of about fifteen influentials. These men in collaboration with and control over numerous leaders in the system held almost complete influence over economic and public policy in the district. Most of the influentials in the structure were about fifty years of age and had resided in the community all of their lives. This probably promoted an inbreeding of provincial ideas among the leaders in the system.

Men in the system influenced state and even national activities affecting the district. The local press was a propagandizing agent for the policy views of those in the power structure. These views were effectively diffused through the formal and informal communication network of the structure. By use of a test of conservatism-liberalism we established the fact that the influentials held very conservative civic beliefs. The conservative policies of the influentials were reinforced by an extremist society which spent much time harassing the school officials.

It was difficult to pass new matter, energy, or information across the system boundary. When new ideas or practices were promoted in the system by forces outside the community, the system experienced stress and became more solidary in its reaction against the inputs. The aim of the system was to keep its degree of equilibrium intact—to protect the status quo. In one instance a proposal was outlined for locating a large factory in the district. This was effectively opposed by the influentials in the structure. The large enterprise represented the potential imbalancing input of new matter (new residents and new businesses), and information (new management and worker ideas). The size of the input was enough to constitute a threat to the system. Interestingly, several of the

organized interest groups adopted policies encouraging only small, "clean" enterprises and underwriting tourism as the fundamental economic support of the community.

Control over the exchange of matter, energy, and information was further enhanced by relatively slow change in the population characteristics. A rapid growth in population would have made the maintenance of the status quo (equilibrium) much more difficult if not impossible. Empirical studies of community power have shown that a large increase in population with different characteristics from the indigenous population majority may result in drastic changes in the power system.

System reaction to inputs with reference to significant changes in the school policies was consistent with the "factory" incident just discussed. For example, after several "ugly" incidents the board of education (a tool of the power structure) passed a strict policy censoring the use of certain instructional materials in the classroom. Especially suspect were projects promoted by university professors. The climate of the school system was geared to maintaining the status quo. Sizable increase in taxes for school purposes had been resisted for so many years that it was among the lowest financial effort school districts in the state or, for that matter, the nation. Radical innovations in the school system would have been impossible, especially if they required additional tax revenue. Every educational proposal which might affect the economic balance in the system was sanctioned via the appointment of ritualistic committees chaired by the influentials in the system. Educators were almost powerless in the system.

Multigroup Noncompetitive Systems

Many authorities voice the mistaken assumption that all multigroup systems are open. This may not be true. Recently we studied a school district that encompassed several small towns of about the same population size. Each of these towns had a power structure. The leaders of these different structures did not manifest interstructural ties characteristic of monopolistic systems. Even though this was a multigroup system, there was marked agreement among the leaders concerning educational policies. That is, the influentials of these different groups held similar beliefs and attitudes about the nature of community living and the process of education.

The system was marked by a high degree of consensus in ideas. There were no regime-like conflicts between the leaders over such questions as "what kind of schools ours should be." Competition was restricted to the awarding of contracts and fees. No force within the system was strong enough to challenge the status quo. The very fact that a high degree of consensus existed promoted an effecitve form of closure to environmental inputs. Furthermore, this system illustrates that closed and open properties of political systems may sometimes be independent of structure. Thus, multigroup structures could conceivably have a higher degree of closure than openness to change.

The multigroup noncompetitive system in this case represents what happens when entropy is maximized and a state of near equilibrium in ideas is established. The leaders in the system had reached a point of balance (consensus) in ideas. Thus, they had nothing new or different within the system to produce stress. The leaders were satisfied with the status quo.

The superintendent of schools, a lifelong resident of the community, had held office for over 35 years. During this period the schools followed a traditional curriculum organization without abrupt modification of goals.

Examples of Open Systems

How do closed systems contrast with systems tending to be more open? To explore this I will discuss two types of "open" political systems. I am referring to the competitive elite and the fragmented pluralistic types of power structures. Both of these structures are usually more open to the emergence of leadership than monopolistic structures. They adapt their goals, norms, interaction patterns, and normative perceptions about community living in response to the exchange of matter, information, and energy with the environment.

Segmented Pluralism

The pluralistic power structure consists of several fragmented centers of power. Numerous organized interest groups and informal groups are effective centers of power upon governmental policy. A pluralism is also characterized by effective citizen participation in decisions. In the hypothesized pure typology, the fragmented system is held together by a core of elected and appointed public officials and civic-minded citizens. The people participate effectively in the decisions rendered upon public policy through organized interest groups. With its openness to inputs, the direct participation of the masses of citizens, and the characteristic free competition in the "market place" of public opinion, a pluralism is thought by social scientists to be consistent with democratic government. A characteristic of pluralism is the fragmentation of interests and activities

among the leaders who run the different governmental agencies. There is little overlap of leader participation in more than one public function (e.g., education, health, planning and zoning, etc.) as tends to be true of the competitive elite type power structure described in the following paragraph.

Competitive Elite System

The competitive elite structure is found in numerous school districts. In a competitive system two or more groups of power wielders engage in competition which transcends at least two elections or several consecutive public issues. Power exchanges occur. A regime conflict over the "kind of a town we want" exists. The system adapts to new goals, different interaction patterns, and improved perceptions of community living. There is considerable overlap in leader participation in more than one public function as opposed to fragmented pluralism wherein leaders tend to exercise leadership in one public function only. Presthus has observed that the mere presence of competition is not a pluralism.[4] Competition occurs among groups--all of which are elites. Relatively few leaders, in comparison to the total population of the school district, actually participate effectively in the process of decision-making for the school district. The centers of interaction and many of the solidary groups, which are a part of the structure, are often informal groups.

As an illustration of an open political system, let us examine briefly a community with a competitive elite power system. You will note the contrast of this system with the monopolistic system discussed previously.

---

[4]Robert Presthus, Men at the Top: A Study in Community Power (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964).

Over forty-two influentials from business, agriculture, the professions and elected public officials were active in the system. These influentials interacted with hundreds of other leaders who performed various roles in the maintenance of the system. Public officials had much more power in the system than was true in the monopolistic structure discussed previously. Several very powerful groups of these influentials and their followers participated effectively in decision-making. Regime conflicts concerning the "kind of town we want" involved practically every public agency, including the educational system. Noticeable new goals, policy changes, and changes in the dynamics of the power system were documented. For example, public policy adaptations were in evidence with reference to planning and zoning ordinances, school operations, public housing, and other civic projects. The political system was in a steady state of goal revision and policy adaptation to environmental inputs.

What was the main source of the inputs of energy, matter, and information which "opened" the system? In this case we concluded that the rapid increase (100 percent in one decade) in population with different characteristics from the indigenous population majority was the primary source of inputs. These new residents brought with them different ideas. They were unstructured and did not vote as led by the dominant political structure. Therefore, a strong two-party system combined with emerging centers of power produced regime-like conflicts which forced a restructuring of the political power system. The old system boundary was permeated and a new boundary was in the process of formation at the time of our study. Yet, in spite of the regime conflict, the system was held together in its process of reformation by the frequent conciliatory interaction of influentials from the different groups.

The educational subsystem was best described as "progressive." It was supported by the highest financial effort of any district in the state. New school buildings were of modern design, including year-round temperature control. Generally speaking, the school system was progressive in adopting new management procedures but did not have a reputation for curriculum innovation. However, a recent extensive instructional innovation was undertaken in one elementary school. This elementary school project was carried out without opposition and was indicative of the adaptive climate developing in the school system.

The superintendent of schools was one of the nine most powerful influentials in the district. In fact, he was said by numerous informants to operate "a dynasty."

Comparative Study of School Districts

Professor R. L. Johns and I are conducting a comparative study of power structure in selected school districts in four states.[5] Currently we have completed the studies in the state of Florida. Six school districts in Florida with a population above 20,000 were selected. Three districts which were among the highest financial effort districts in the state and three districts which had the lowest financial effort in the state were selected. I will describe briefly some of the comparative findings from the Florida districts.

In terms of the types of power structures described previously, one of the district power structures was monopolistic, two were multigroup

---

5R. L. Johns and Ralph B. Kimbrough, "Relationship Between Socioeconomic Factors, Educational Leadership Patterns, and Elements of Community Power Structure and Local Fiscal Policy," (U. S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project: 2842, In Progress).

noncompetitive, two were competitive elite, and one was classified as a segmented pluralism. The power structures of the high effort districts were classified as competitive elite and pluralistic, whereas the power structures of the low effort districts were classified as multigroup noncompetitive or monopolistic. In applying the open and closed concepts discussed previously, the power systems of the high financial effort districts had a relatively higher degree of openness than the low financial effort districts. Obviously we are in no position to indicate a relationship between financial effort and power system openness or closedness characteristics based on so few districts. One can conclude from the comparative study in Florida that the power systems of school districts vary.

One of the findings which should not be overlooked in importance in the Florida sample is that the higher financial effort district power systems were characterized by a climate of conflict, whereas consensus was more descriptive of the lower effort districts. Consequently, educators might well reexamine the high value which has traditionally been placed upon consensus. Is it reasonable to expect that the climate of consensus characterizes the community power structures of progressive school districts?

The study revealed other interesting differences between the districts. For instance, only 22 percent of the influentials in the power structure of the high effort districts were native born in the districts as compared with 78 percent of native born in the low effort districts. The average increase in population between 1950 and 1960 of the high effort districts was almost 133 percent, whereas the increase for low effort districts was

only 49 percent. Earlier I suggested that a large immigration of leadership and population of a different characteristic than the indigenous population majority would produce power rearrangements in the community. The low effort districts had a much higher incidence of kinship ties in the power systems than was found in high effort districts. In other measures - such as the educational level, age, and number of children of the influentials - there was not a significant difference among the districts.

Voting patterns and patterns of leader involvement were different between the high and low financial effort districts. For example, a significantly higher percentage of voting in primary elections was found in low effort districts, whereas a higher percentage of participation in voting in general elections was found in the high effort districts. Also, a significantly higher percent of influential involvement in community issues was found in the low effort districts.

The studies which we are making and studies made by other persons indicate clearly that we must view political systems as reacting, changing, and adapting to inputs which are significant enough to threaten their survival. Even the relatively closed monopolistic structure often is forced to seek a new point of equilibrium and experiences some redefinition and change. Systems which experience a sudden massive input from their environment (e.g., a large public project or factory) may experience change in the structure of power. Thus, we know that political systems may change from monopolistic to pluralistic and vice versa in time. These are not static systems.

The Effect of Political Systems Upon The Climate for Educational Change

The educator interested in planned curriculum change should view political power systems as having degrees of open and closed climates. The school system is a subsystem of the community power system. As such, the school system interacts with and exchanges matter, energy, and information with the community system. The community system (including the school subsystem) in turn exchanges matter, energy, and information with its environment (state and national systems). The tendency toward equilibrium is maximized in school districts that are subsystems of closed political systems. Certain limits exist beyond which the schools may not proceed with curriculum innovations. In the past these limits have been effectively defined by budgets. Many educators have not realized that "real" innovations are going to cost much money. This is why foundations have been prominently identified with the trial of educational innovations.

In open political systems the school system can be more adaptive than schools in closed systems unless the educational leadership, acting as a subsystem, attempts "closure" instead of exchange with its environment. In open systems the tendency toward equilibrium is minimized. Educators may make more extensive curriculum innovations in open systems with the input of less energy than would be possible if the system were closed. Since the energy (power) of educators is limited in many districts, one would expect that schools in school districts with open political systems would make more innovations than schools in closed systems, provided the educational leadership in the districts is of comparable effectiveness.

When we view the school as a social system in interaction with other social systems, a number of questions arise. Is it possible, for example,

for open school systems to survive in closed political systems? Do closed school systems survive in open political systems? How does the school leader work in cooperation with other leaders to produce an open political system? Can the monopolistic system become an open system by changing the beliefs of influentials in the structure? How much increase in energy, information, and matter inputs from the state and federal systems is necessary to bring about a redefinition of the power structure of a local district? Will the new federal programs include enough inputs of energy, information, and matter to induce a better climate for innovation? Is the federal "program" really a closed system which tends ultimately to seek its own level of equilibrium? How can the school leaders obtain more energy (power) in promoting ideas for change within closed systems?

Strategies for Change

The concept of complex interacting social systems indicates why the process of educational change is so complicated. Influencing the change process through the community power system itself is sometimes a Herculean undertaking. However, my studies of community power systems lead me to suggest that the undertaking is not an impossible one. Educators can, and indeed must, initiate and influence change through the community power system.

In the foregoing discussion I have discussed the general significance of community power systems in establishing a climate for educational change. In previous writings on the subject I have emphasized the direct influence of power structures upon specific school projects, such as school bond elections, teacher salary raises, racial integration, and the election of school board members. In thinking about strategies for influencing the power structure, therefore, educators need to develop strategies which will:

(1) influence the structural process of the system itself to make it adaptive (open) to educational change; (2) promote the adoption of educational change through the existing system. Thus, educators have responsibilities for leadership in developing the system in addition to using the existing system effectively to promote educational change.

Improving the Political Climate for Educational Change

Recently in a discussion on planned changes within school organizations, Miles postulated a concept of organizational health as associated with the process of change.[6] Miles suggests that educators consider the definition of an ideal state of organizational health as a goal toward which we might attempt to move unhealthy social systems. This is, of course, analogous to thinking about the mentally and physically healthy organism. His proposition is important in the discussion of community power systems. That is, as mentioned previously, educators have civic responsibilities in cooperation with other citizens to treat the functioning power system so that it provides a climate which facilitates educational improvement.

Miles' terminology of system health, however, may be more appropriate for specific subsystems, such as the elementary school, than it would for the more complex community power system. Arguing the point would be fruitless at this time. I am going to use the concept of development in the case of power systems. Just as we commonly speak of "emerging," "developing," and "developed," nations in the world, we might think of community systems in different stages of development. The developed

---

[6]Mathew B. Miles, "Planned Change and Organizational Health: Figure and Ground," in Richard O. Carlson, et. al., Change Process in the Public Schools (Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965), pp. 11-34.

community power system might be characterized by openness and the ability to cope effectively with environmental changes and goal redefinition in such a way as to enhance the lives (meet the needs) of its citizens. The emerging system could be characterized by closure, "patchwork" attention to environmental inputs, outmoded goals, and lack of response to the need dispositions of sizable groups of citizens.

Agger and associates define four types of community regimes: underdeveloped democracy, oligarchy, guided democracy, and developed democracy.[7] Underdeveloped democracy, for example, "...exists when citizens who have political demands to make feel impotent because they erroneously expect that illegitimate sanctions will be used against them."[8] A developed democracy exists when citizens feel that they can participate effectively in government and that government officials are responsive to their demands. This concept of development is based upon two conditions: (1) the extent to which citizens believe that they can make their preferences felt in influencing government without suffering illegitimate sanctions; (2) the probability that citizen attempts to change or continue the function of government will be blocked by the exercise of illegitimate sanctions.[9]

Although I am not claiming to describe a developed power system here, there are some concepts worthy of mention. Certainly a developed power system demands effective citizen participation in the formulation of governmental policy, including educational policy. The developed system, furthermore, is open to the emergence of new leaders to positions of power

---

[7]Robert Agger, Daniel Goldrich, and Bert Swanson, The Rulers and the Ruled (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964).

[8]Ibid., p. 87.

[9]Ibid., p. 83.

in the system. The influentials in the system are responsive to the need dispositions of citizens. Processes of decision-making in the developed system is open and adaptive to citizen and environmental inputs. The open system, therefore, provides for educators a set of conditions through which they can, in the absence of illegitimate sanctions, make educational needs known to influentials in the system with the feeling that authorities will be responsive.

This overly brief, debatable description of development is given only in the spirit of encouraging educators to think seriously about their responsibility to cooperate with other citizens in providing leadership toward some ideal system. The implication in all of this is that educational leaders have a civic responsibility which goes beyond the mere sporadic promotion of bond elections, tax increases, and curriculum changes through an existing system. Our strategies must reflect concern for the development of the system itself which also increases the probability that educational development will become a reality. Educators must not assume that they are to proceed alone. They proceed in cooperation with other groups and leaders outside the field of education that are interested in improving the system. Clearly educational leadership, then, involves political leadership. Educators have always been engaged in political strategies. Our schools were born of and are continued through the tooth and claw politics of state legislatures. By what means shall we declare the often convulsive processes of local school government as nonpolitical, presided over as it is, not by amateurs, but by the teachers of politicians? Blind perpetuations of myths will not disentangle the salaries of teachers from taxes nor from the competition for money for schools, highways, streets, and hospitals.

Whether politics is conceived as either the art or the science of government, or both, it appears that educators are active politicians. As an art we actively attempt to influence government policy in the field of education. Politics is the process of influencing policy. Obviously superintendents must continuously attempt to influence policies and, on occasion, venture outside the field of education in the process. In my studies, I have found politically perceptive school superintendents confronted with the necessity of influencing policies in such areas as planning and zoning, streets and highways, health standards, and property assessment practices. School boards do not exist in a political vacuum completely divorced from the socioeconomic forces that help shape the political climate of a community. When the school superintendent enters the grubby business of promoting bond referendums and millage elections, he is in politics. Instead of our dreaming dreams about escape from politics, we must help the educator in his endeavor to become an astute politician.

Use of Political Strategies

The concept of social systems provides a theoretical construct for influencing change through the community power system. For instance, the system has a boundary. It has degrees of closedness and openness. The system acts in such a way as to survive in its environment. It exchanges matter, energy, and information with its environment—the state, regional, and national systems. Changing the system often involves the variation of environmental inputs of matter, energy, and information in large enough amounts to produce stress and eventual adaptation or change. Also, to bring about system adaptations, one can visualize the use of subsystem

inputs, such as well organized political strategies of educators. Thus variations in the amount of exchanges of energy, matter, and information between systems, depending upon their degrees of openness or closedness, become not only a measure of political climate but also an indicator of the amount and kind of educational change possible within a particular community. Further, the types and amounts of input that are necessary to the dynamic survival of the subsystem with which we are most concerned--that of the schools--are important considerations for educational leaders.

In past years educators have used techniques which were based primarily upon persuasion for promoting educational improvement in the community. For instance, the citizen committee movement emphasized the direct involvement of community influentials in the study of school needs. The assumption was that the influentials would, through studying the facts, become persuaded to support school improvement. The grass-roots, public relations approach relies primarily upon the input of information about school needs to the masses. Those who accept this approach assume that an open political system exists and that citizens will become persuaded to provide a massive input of energy into changing the behavior of the system toward education.

The expert type survey is a technique often used to bring inputs from the environment to bear upon the system. A group of "outside" experts are brought in to study the school system and transmit information about school needs to the public. Usually these "expert" inputs are attempted through the use of mass media, reports to community and organized interest groups, and written summaries which are sent to large numbers of citizens. The general idea is to confront the system with "the facts" along with massive recommendations for change.

The disappointing results of many expert surveys in opening the power system to educational change led to the use of cooperative type comprehensive school surveys. Hence, we bring the experts and community influentials together in a cooperative study of school needs. We hope through the process to cause the influentials to have a "change of heart" toward their support of educational change.

For many educators the results of these techniques for change have been disappointing. There are numerous reasons why we have not used these techniques effectively. It is difficult to place the blame on any one factor. One obvious reason is that educators often do not understand clearly the political system in their school district. We have not always tailored our techniques to the political realities. We have used these techniques like shots in the dark rather than as part of a well-organized political strategy. Leaders in education have also failed to back up inputs with solidary political power. Poorly organized, sporadically used political strategies and splintered teacher support of educational improvement projects are, unfortunately, characteristics of educational leadership in politics. I would suggest, therefore, that we not discard such techniques as citizens committees, surveys, and public relations programs because they have not produced miracles in the past. These can be very useful techniques as parts of planned strategies for educational change.

One of the first questions which educators must answer in the development of political strategies is whether they really want to make changes. If so, what changes do they wish to make? One of the problems which bothers me when I talk to groups of educators is whether, in reality, many of them want to change the system. Recently the participants in a

conference on change were asked what they wanted to change. The embarrassing silence of the group was finally broken by some rather petty suggestions for improvement. How sure are the numerous scholars on the change process that their audiences want to make changes? Do educators have clearly defined goals for educational improvement?

The tendency to ride out the whirlwind and keep the boat from rocking may be more prevalent among educators than the agressive promotion of revolutionary educational change. Evidence also shows that short tenure of school administrators has been associated with aggressive attempts to influence the power system. For example, Todd's study showed that the average tenure of superintendents who were "agents of change" was less than half the tenure of superintendents who were "agents of resistence."[10] Whether our improved knowledge of the political process will help superintendents promote stress producing changes in the power system without the backlashes which interrupt administrative tenure remains to be seen. I am hopeful that by making politics a serious responsibility of educators much of the personal abuse experienced by school leaders will be eliminated.

The first question in making educational change, then, is to decide what change we desire. What should education be like in the school district? Starting with some well-defined goals, we are in position to assign priorities in the political strategies for change. School people are not powerless in the political arena. The superintendent of schools, for example, holds a powerful public position. He can use this position to influence change

---

[10]Eugene A. Todd, The Administration of Change: A Study of Administrative Tenure, (Houston: Bureau of Education Research and Services, University of Houston, 1963).

For instance, he can use his position to improve the frequency and effectiveness of citizen participation in educational decisions. This suggestion is based upon the idea of some social scientists that the effective involvement of citizens in public affairs will bring about a redistribution of power within the community power system. It is assumed that the new direct inputs (energy, information, matter) of large numbers of citizens would be of sufficient quantity that the system would be forced to adapt to change (reach a steady state).

In most power systems latent centers of power exist which are not involved effectively in decisions. The change agent may seek to bring these latent centers of power into the process of supporting educational improvement projects and eventually changes of control within the power system itself. An example of this in one school district was the use of executives in absentee owned corporations to challenge the control of a monopolistic structure. The executives and their following were not previously involved in the political system.

Some writers contend that the only alternative open to the change agent is to organize a revolutionary attack (meet force with force) upon the distribution of power within the community power system. For instance, Saul Alinsky promotes change in the system by organizing the underprivileged, forgotten classes into effective political power groups.[11] These "people" oriented groups represent enough power to force a redistribution of power in the system. Thus, the system is effectively opened to change.

---

[11] Saul D. Alinsky, Reveille for Radicals (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946).

I have encouraged strategies which include effective interaction of educational leaders with influentials in the community power system. The process of interaction is important in the crystallization of normative perceptions and the differentiation of leadership role in the system. Educators who remain aloof from personal interaction with community leadership will not be richly rewarded with leadership in the community power structure. In a recent study I asked influentials to tell how often the school superintendent had talked with them personally in past years about school conditions. I was somewhat surprised to learn that it had been years since a school superintendent had taken the time personally to discuss educational ideas with the influentials. This could be a critical factor in whether school projects were acceptable to the school district.

The influentials of a power system have vast influence in legitimizing ideas. Their approval of a suggested innovation, for example, would assure its acceptance by many citizens in the community. Therefore, this group of leaders is not to be overlooked in the development of strategies for educational change. Studies of the process of change among farmers, for instance, show that the adoption of a new idea by influential farmers is followed by rapid diffusion and adoption of the idea by the majority of farmers in the community.

The need for solidary teacher political activity in support of educational improvement projects was cited previously. A cohesive group of teachers combined with effective political leadership can produce a significant impact upon politics. Open power systems, for example, are surprisingly responsive to a small, solidary, politically perceptive group of leaders. How often do educators check into whether teachers exercise the vote? School

bond issues sometimes fail by a few votes; a few teacher votes would have reversed the outcome.

I shall not continue with a discussion of the different strategies and techniques which the leader may use to influence educational changes. There are many more than could be discussed in one paper. There are strong indications that the educational leadership in the political arena will improve in the future.

Educators are awakening uneasily to the proposition that to change educational policy at any level (local, state, national) involves effective political activity. The traditional politics and administration dichotomy is no longer considered possible or desirable by many authorities. The growth in teacher militancy is ample evidence that many of the rank and file teachers are abandoning the exclusive use of persuasion in favor of the collective use of power. In view of the relative power position of educators in the political power system, this was an inevitable direction for teachers. I suspect that teachers who take politics seriously will make some difference in the distribution of community and state power. In fact, if they use their potential power effectively, they can make a big difference.